

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

4876	E-13657	1-1111			
NER		John Hoard	08/26/2003	10/648,885	
11ER	EXAMI		0 06/28/2006	759	
DWARD M				Douglas E. McKinley, Jr.	
PAPER NUMBER	ART UNIT		Office	McKinley Law (
TALERNOMBER					
1754 DATE MAILED: 06/28/2006				P.O. Box 202 Richland, WA	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/648,885	HOARD ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Edward M. Johnson	1754				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply						
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from account application to become ABANDONEI	lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 M	arch 2004.					
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b) ⊠ This	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-49 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or 	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	epted or b) objected to by the Eddrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application rity documents have been received u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)						
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/648,885 Page 2

Art Unit: 1754

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words in length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 9-21, 29-41, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deeba et al. US 6,093,378.

Regarding claims 1, 21, and 41, Deeba '378 discloses a method for treating exhaust containing NOx comprising treatment with a first and second zeolite component (abstract), wherein the first component may be a barium Y zeolite (see column 11, lines 27-40), and reduces NOx at temperatures of about 150, 175-350, or up to about 325 degrees C (see column 8, lines 18-24). Deeba '378 further discloses pores of at least about 5 Angstroms (see column 10, lines 23-27), the second component comprising silver (see column 4, lines 42-46), and supported on gamma alumina (see column 12, lines 10-14 and column 8, lines 35-37).

Deeba '378 fails to disclose converting a portion of the gas stream to a reducing gas.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to convert a portion of the gas stream to a reducing gas because Deeba discloses the barium zeolite composition traps hydrocarbons and releases as reducing agent (see column 8, lines 13-19), which would motivate an ordinary artisan to trap the hydrocarbons as disclosed and convert them to reducing agent to be used in NOx conversion, as disclosed.

Application/Control Number: 10/648,885

Art Unit: 1754

Regarding claims 9-11, 14-15, 29-31, 34-35, and 49, Deeba
'378 discloses the first component may be a barium Y zeolite
(see column 11, lines 27-40) with an exchangeable Na cation (see claim 16).

Regarding claims 12-13 and 32-33, Deeba '378 pores of at least about 5 Angstroms (see column 10, lines 23-27).

Regarding claims 16-20 and 36-40, Deeba '378 discloses the second component comprising silver (see column 4, lines 42-46) or In (see column 11, lines 49-54) and supported on gamma alumina (see column 12, lines 10-14 and column 8, lines 35-37).

5. Claims 2-8, 22-28, and 42-48 are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Deeba '378 as applied to claims 1, 21, and 41 above, and further in view of Balko et al. US 6,176,078.

Regarding claims 2-4, 22-24, 42-44, Deeba '378 fails to disclose acetaldehyde and formaldehyde.

Balko '078 discloses acetaldehyde and formaldehyde.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the acetaldehyde and/or formaldehyde of Balko in the NOx reduction over silver alumina zeolite process of Deeba because Balko discloses the acetaldehyde and formaldehyde for use in NOx control (title)

Application/Control Number: 10/648,885 Page 5

Art Unit: 1754

which exhibits improved NOx reduction in a silver aluminate catalyst (column 7, lines 62-63).

Regarding 5-8, 25-28, 45-48, Balko '078 discloses the presence of plasma to induce a number of reactions which produce molecules ideally suited for reducing agent (abstract).

Conclusion

- 6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Grasselli et al. US 5,374,410 discloses a NOx effluent abatement process comprising reducing the effluent reducing NOx at 200-600 degrees C over zeolite (see abstract and Examples); Yamamoto et al. US 6,047,544 discloses NOx purification comprising contact with zeolite hydrocarbon absorbent formed on alumina substrate and having specific dimensions (see abstract and description).
- 7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edward M. Johnson whose telephone number is 571-272-1352 The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley S. Silverman can be reached on 571-272-1358. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Edward M. Johnson Primary Examiner Art Unit 1754 Page 6

EMJ